



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,234	12/03/2001	Jonathan L. Rowlands	TI-29978	5084
23494	7590	03/29/2006	EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED			HENNING, MATTHEW T	
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999			ART UNIT	
DALLAS, TX 75265			PAPER NUMBER	
			2131	
DATE MAILED: 03/29/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/998,234	Applicant(s) ROWLANDS, JONATHAN L.	
Examiner Matthew T. Henning	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7 and 13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1 This action is in response to the communication filed on 10/19/2005.

2 **DETAILED ACTION**

3 ***Response to Arguments***

4 Applicant's argue primarily that Saito did not disclose the limitations of the second
5 connection having a lower bandwidth than the first connection. Applicant relies on the fact that
6 Saito did not mention the bandwidths of the connections. However, the specification of the
7 present application is somewhat vague as to these limitations as well. The only support for these
8 limitations comes from the first two paragraphs of the description of the preferred embodiments
9 wherein the applicant provides an example of a "high-bandwidth data connection" as a direct
10 connection between two devices and provides an example of a "low-speed" (the examiner is
11 interpreting this to be interchangeable with "low-bandwidth") networks as "traditional wired or
12 cellular telephone networks". Col. 12 paragraph 2 of Saito shows that the "first connection"
13 between the primary and secondary user terminals can be a direct connection as opposed to a
14 connection through the network. Based on the specification of the present application, this
15 appears to meet the limitation of a "high-bandwidth" connection. Col. 12 Lines 1-2 of Saito
16 show that the second connection was through a network such as a public telephone line, which,
17 as discussed above, according to the specification of the present application is a "low-speed"
18 connection. Therefore, although Saito does not directly address the bandwidths of the
19 connections, based on the specification of the present application and the types of connections
20 disclosed by Saito, Saito did disclose the required limitations. Therefore, the examiner does not
21 find the argument persuasive and has maintained the prior art rejections presented in the office
22 action dated 9/20/2005.

1 All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

2 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the
4 basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

5 *A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –*

6 *(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section*
7 *122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or*
8 *(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the*
9 *invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the*
10 *treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an*
11 *application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United*
12 *States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.*
13

14 Claims 1, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saito (US
15 Patent Number 6,449,717).

16 Regarding claim 1, Saito disclosed a method of data distribution preserving rights of a
17 remote party (See Saito Abstract and Fig. 1) comprising the steps of: an authorized user locally
18 transmitting data to a receiver (See Saito Fig. 1 and Col. 6 Lines 34-36) employing a local
19 connection having a first bandwidth (See Saito Col. 12 Second Paragraph); and following said
20 locally transmitting step, authorizing the receiver's use of the data by a trusted agent (See Saito
21 Col. 6 Lines 48-65) employing a network having a second bandwidth less than said first
22 bandwidth (See Saito Col. 12 Lines 1-2).

23 Regarding claim 7, Saito disclosed that said step of locally transmitting data includes
24 directly connecting an apparatus of the authorized user to an apparatus of the receiver (See Saito
25 Col. 12 Lines 9-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downs et al. (US Patent Number 6,574,609) hereinafter referred to as Downs, and further in view of Saito.

Regarding claim 3, Downs disclosed a method of data distribution preserving rights of a remote party comprising the steps of: the sender choosing an encryption key for the receiver's use (See Downs Col. 22 Lines 17-19); the sender encrypting the data using the key (See Downs Col. 22 Lines 17-19); the sender encrypting the encryption key using a public encryption key of a trusted agent (See Downs Col. 22 Lines 20-21); the sender locally transmitting both the encrypted data and the encrypted key to the receiver (See Downs Col. 22 Lines 30-59 and Col. 23 Lines 36-41); the receiver and the trusted agent negotiating licensing and payment for the data (See Downs Col. 22 Line 60 – Col. 23 Line 28); the receiver transmitting the encrypted key to the trusted agent (See Downs Col. 22 Line 60 – Col. 23 Line 28); the trusted agent decrypting the encryption key (See Downs Col. 23 Lines 22-23); and the trusted agent sending the decrypted encryption key to the receiver to receive the full data (See Downs Col. 23 Lines 22-28), but

1 Downs failed to disclose that the encrypted data could be transmitted prior to the license
2 negotiation and key transmission.

3 Saito teaches a content distribution system in which a first user provided a second user
4 with encrypted content employing a local connection (See Saito Col. 12 Paragraph 2), followed
5 by the second user negotiating use of the content and receiving the decryption key from a trusted
6 agent (See Saito Fig. 1 and related text) employing a local telephone line (See Saito Col. 12
7 Lines 1-2).

8 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
9 invention to employ the teachings of Saito in the content distribution system of Downs by
10 transferring content directly from a first user to a second user followed by the second user
11 negotiating license and usage of the content and acquiring the decryption key for the content.
12 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
13 motivated to provide more flexible distribution of the content while protecting the interests of the
14 copyright owner of content.

15 Regarding claim 4, the combination of Downs and Saito disclosed the receiver choosing a
16 new encryption key unknown to the sender and encrypting the data with the new encryption key
17 (See Downs Col. 79 Lines 26-37).

18 Regarding claim 13, the combination of Downs and Saito disclosed that said step of
19 locally transmitting both the encrypted data and the encrypted key includes directly connecting
20 an apparatus of the sender to an apparatus of the receiver (See Saito Col. 12 Lines 9-10).

21

22

Conclusion

Claims 1, 3-4, 7, and 13 have been rejected.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 2131

1 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
2 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
3 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
4 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
5 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
6 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

7
8
9 

10 Matthew Henning
11 Assistant Examiner
12 Art Unit 2131
13 3/22/2006

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

 3/26/06